

# THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Entered as second-class matter November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 1, 1879

VOL. VIII

NEW YORK, APRIL 17, 1915

No. 23

For many years I devoted much time to an occupation laborious in the extreme, yet full of pleasure, and of profit in divers ways. I mean the working out of minute and carefully ordered analyses of Latin writings, partly of writings in verse, but in the main, it happened, of works in prose, especially of works of Cicero. I was led to do this by dissatisfaction with the analyses of Cicero's oratorical and philosophical writings available in our editions, both American and foreign. To be sure, it was plain that the inadequacy of the editions was due in part to lack of space, but it seemed true also that in many cases the analyses had been made in mechanical fashion, without attempt to read in the large, and, in consequence, without serious effort to group together, in appropriate divisions, the thought elements that logically belonged together. As I used such editions with classes, I found it easy to excuse the failure of young students to grasp rightly the thought of the original.

An example of a good analysis is the paper entitled *The Structure of Cicero's Oratio Pro Lege Manilia*, by Professor Charles E. Little, in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY*, 5.82-84. As a specimen of the by-products that may result from careful, logical analysis I may cite a portion of an article published by me in *The American Journal of Philology* 28.56-65; the article dealt with Cicero *De Officiis* 1.7-8. Here, for many years, editors had assumed a lacuna in §7, or had bracketed one or more sentences in §8, or had done both these things at once. Now, in *The American Journal of Philology* 27.112, in a short comment in Brief Mention on an edition of Cicero, *Disputationes Tusculanae* I-II, by T. W. Duggan, one of those expensive but valueless books that University Presses occasionally publish, I had called attention to the editor's failure to consider the sectioning and the paragraphing of the books with which he had tried to deal, and his failure to show how various sections of the first book, for instance, fitted into the general scheme of that book. Acting on the principles there outlined I suggested in the discussion of Cicero *De Officiis* 1.7-8 that Chapter III of Book 1 and Section 7 of the book should begin simultaneously—not as in the current editions, the Teubner text, for instance. Such corrected marking of section and chapter aided materially toward the conclusion, reached in the paper, that §§7-8 as they stand may well have come from Cicero's pen.

In a footnote occupying the greater part of pages 58-59 I worked out a complete re-paragraphing of the three

books of the *De Officiis*, in accordance with the following principles:

(1) the limits assigned to individual sections should correspond to the limits of distinctly marked thoughts; (2) only sections dealing with kindred thoughts should be grouped in a paragraph; (3) sections dealing with kindred thoughts should be grouped in a paragraph.

Simple as these principles are, they were not respected by the scholars who, a long time ago, worked out the paragraphing of our texts. Nor have they been respected, as they should be, by the writers of the annotated editions of the last thirty or forty years. In one extreme case every subsection of a certain much-read Latin work is printed as a separate and distinct paragraph, a procedure which interferes markedly with my own understanding of this book, and must have an even worse effect on the young student, who is all too prone to regard separation on the printed page as command for such separation in his own thoughts. Since merely general or merely negative criticism is to me abhorrent, I present here an analysis of Cicero *Cato Maior*, with some comments on the analysis. If it seems worth while, I shall print, as space permits, analyses of other writings of Cicero, say of the *Pro Ligario* and the *Pro Marcello*.

## ANALYSIS OF THE CATO MAIOR

I. *Dedicatory and Introductory* = modern preface: 1-3<sup>1</sup>.

(a) Dedication: in part informal, in part formal: 1, through in aliud tempus differenda.

(b) Subject: *De Senectute*: 1, last sentence, *Nunc autem . . . conscribere*.

(c) Motive which determined the choice of this subject: 2 (as now marked<sup>2</sup>)—3, *de senectute misimus*.

(d) Form of the treatise (dialogue), speakers, place, occasion of the dialogue (a remark made by Scipio): 3, *Omnem autem sermonem . . . end<sup>3</sup>*.

II. *Preliminary Conversation*: 4-14, culminating in 15, *Etenim . . . videamus*, in a formal statement of the complaints usually made against old age.

The conversation takes the following course:

<sup>1</sup>References are given by the sections, the subdivisions of the chapters.—An interesting note might be written on the evolution of the preface, from Cato and Varro through Cicero to Livy.

<sup>2</sup>Section 2 should begin with *Nunc autem*, now made part of 1.  
<sup>3</sup>The time of the dialogue is first stated in 14; compare also 19 and 32.

(a) 'How well you bear old age!' (spoken by Scipio for both): 4, Saepe numero. . . dicant sustinere.

(b) 'That's easy for one who has the right conception of life' (Cato): 4, Rem haud sane. . . —5<sup>1</sup>.

(c) 'Please teach us the secret of bearing old age rightly' (Scipio): 6, Atqui. . . possumus.

(d) 'I will, if you really wish it' (Cato): 6, Faciam vero. . . futurum est.

(e) 'We do indeed wish it' (Laelius): 6, Volumus sane. . . videre quale sit.

(f) 'Very well, then, I will, as best I can. And I can, because I have heard the subject discussed, and I have noted that the disputants never touched the root of the matter. The trouble is not in old age but in old men. Given the right character and the right environment, we hear no complaint' (Cato, with remark by Laelius, inserted mainly to prevent dialoguedis appearing thus early in monologue): 7-9.

(g) Proof of the foregoing reasoning:

(1) by citation of the career of Fabius Maximus Cunctator: 10-12.

(2) by reference to the careers of the Scipios, Plato, Isocrates, Gorgias: 13.

Thus, in 10-14, we have statesmen and civilians, men of action and men of letters, who in old age were busy, honored, courted, happy.

Then, we have

(3) a reference to Ennius, 14, which leads easily and naturally to a statement in 15, Etenim. . . videamus, of the four kinds of complaints commonly alleged against old age<sup>2</sup>.

C. K.

(To be concluded)

<sup>1</sup>A new section, 4 A, should begin with Cato's reply, at Rem haud sane. . . difficilium admirari videmini. Sections 4 and 5 clearly make one paragraph, in the modern sense of that word, and should always be printed together.

<sup>2</sup>A new section, 15 A, should be marked at A rebus gerendis senectus abstrahit, now included in 15. At that point the third great part of the dialogue, Discussion of the Several Complaints, 15 A-84, begins.—Reference may be made here to my note on *elenchus*, 15, in THE CLASSICAL REVIEW 14, 216.

Two other remarks may be made on 14. The last sentence, Annos septuaginta natus . . . delectari videretur, resumes Sua enim vitia insipientes et suam culpam in senectutem conferunt, quod non faciebat is, cuius modo mentionem feci, Ennius. Equi fortis et victoris senectuti comparat suam. . . After the next five lines, which give us at last the imagined time of the dialogue, such resumption is necessary, and naturally, too, the sentence making the resumption takes a form different from that it would logically have, had not the sentence about the time been inserted. Without that insertion the section would have run, Equi fortis et victoris senectuti comparat suam, annos enim septuaginta natus ita ferebat duo . . . videretur.

Secondly, attention may be called to the fact that Professor Earle maintained that, if the two verses from Ennius's *Annales* regularly given, with the MSS, in this section are to be printed at all, *quiesco*, not *quiescit* should be read. This seems a sound suggestion: the context implies a remark by Ennius, in the first person, about himself: for such remarks see The American Journal of Philology 32, 3-9. Professor Earle, however, was inclined to believe that Cicero did not in fact here quote Ennius's verses, but merely summed up their thought; in the current text we have both quotation and summary. Professor Earle thought the passage would run far better thus: quod non faciebat is, cuius modo mentionem fecit poeta, <qui> equi et victoris senectuti comparat suam, etc. It will be seen that he substituted *poeta* for *Ennius*. Of the further logical improvement which would result had the words fixing the time of the dialogue not been entered here (but rather in 3) he said nothing. See The Classical Papers of Mortimer Lamson Earle, 203.

## THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH AND THE STUDY OF THE CLASSICS<sup>1</sup>

On the present occasion I am expected, as a teacher of English, to address an audience chiefly made up of teachers of Greek and Latin on the cultural value of the Classics. It is a large topic, which we must in some way restrict. There will be a suitable restriction if we discuss the value of an early training in Greek and Latin as it appears to a teacher of English after an experience of a dozen years with pupils in the modern subject; this done, it will not be improper to indulge in a few more general reflections.

To begin with, let us have specially in mind the needs and the opportunities of first-class students when they leave the preparatory school, and are not immediately to engage in active life. They are about to enter the academic course of a College or a University, where they will be called upon to write a good many essays in the mother tongue, and to read not a few of the standard modern authors. What qualities, and what training, should we expect them to bring to these and such-like tasks? To write a fair essay demands a certain grade of general cultivation, and to sympathize with one of the great English poets—with Spenser or Milton, for example, or, let us say, with Coleridge—means that one must have something in common, in the way of training, with a man who wrote well, partly because of his genius, but partly also because he was well-taught. This immediately raises the question, How have the masters of the English tongue been educated—how have they learned to write?

Before suggesting an answer to this question, it may not be out of place to marvel at teachers of English and of other modern literatures, at our administrative officers in the higher education, and above all at our professors of pedagogy, for their general lack of interest in certain inquiries which no teacher, and no leader in the art of teaching, should ever neglect. Their interests commonly are of another sort. They have traced the history of various movements in education, and they can tell you, it may be, what Plato and Comenius, or Herbart and Rousseau have said or thought about the discipline of youth; they can even explain the relation of experimental psychology to what we used to call 'mental arithmetic'; but they have given little heed to the way in which great teachers actually have taught, or men of acknowledged attainments have acquired their power. We need not pursue this line of thought beyond remarking that the authors in whose works our collegians must read, and about whom they must write, have, almost to a man, had a classical training, and have not secured their command over the English tongue without an acquaintance with Greek and Latin. The record of the studies of Chaucer, Spenser, Shakespeare, Milton, Wordsworth, Tennyson, and Browning, and of Chatham, Burke, and Newman, represents the

<sup>1</sup>This paper was read before The Classical Association of the Atlantic States at its Eighth Annual Meeting, at Barnard College, April 18, 1914.

great experiment in English education—an experiment lasting through centuries, a successful one, and one whose results no teacher or theorist on teaching can safely disregard.

So much in general; it may be wise to add a concrete illustration. Let us attend to the weekly routine of the upper class in Christ's Hospital, the school where Samuel Taylor Coleridge was prepared for Cambridge, and was inflamed with a love of English; where, in fact, he laid the foundations of a literary training. Here is approximately what he and the best of his fellow-pupils, the 'Senior Grecians', were doing at a Charity School at London in the year 1790:

Monday morning: Homer or Tragic Chorus by heart; Greek Tragedy. Monday afternoon: Hebrew Psalter; Horace or Juvenal. Written exercise for Monday: English and Latin Theme, in alternate weeks.

Tuesday morning: Xenophon at sight; Homer. Tuesday afternoon: Mathematical Scholium. Exercise for Tuesday: Huntingford's Greek Exercises.

Wednesday morning: Cicero's Orations at sight; Livy or Cicero. Wednesday afternoon: English Speaking; Tacitus. Exercise for Wednesday: Greek Translation.

Thursday morning: Virgil by heart; Demosthenes. Thursday afternoon: Mathematical Scholium. Exercise for Thursday: Greek Verses, and Translation from English into Latin.

Friday morning: Horace or Juvenal by heart; Greek Tragedy or Aristophanes. Friday afternoon: Hebrew; Latin Speaking. Exercise for Friday: Latin Translation.

Saturday morning: Seale's Metres; Repetition. Exercise for Saturday: Latin and English verses alternately, with an abstract.

The historian of the school writes:

As the time of continuance of the Grecians' form is always three, and generally four years, a very considerable acquaintance with the higher classics, as well as a readiness in the composition of English, Greek, and Latin, verse and prose, is easily attainable within this period, and forms a substantial groundwork for the more extensive researches of academical study.

Coleridge himself says:

At school I enjoyed the inestimable advantage of a very sensible, though at the same time a very severe master, <the Rev. James Boyer>. He early moulded my taste to the preference of Demosthenes to Cicero, of Homer and Theocritus to Virgil, and again of Virgil to Ovid. He habituated me to compare Lucretius (in such extracts as I then read), Terence, and above all the chaster poems of Catullus, not only with the Roman poets of the, so-called, silver and brazen ages, but with even those of the Augustan era; and on grounds of plain sense and universal logic to see and assert the superiority of the former in the truth and nativeness both of their thoughts and diction. At the same time that we were studying the Greek tragic poets, he made us read Shakespeare, and Milton as lessons; and they were the lessons, too, which required most time and trouble to 'bring up' so as to escape his censure. I learnt from him that poetry, even that of the loftiest, and, seemingly, that of the wildest odes, had a logic of its own, as severe as that of science, and more difficult, because more subtle, more complex, and dependent upon more, and more fugitive causes. In the truly

great poets, he would say, there is a reason assignable, not only for every word, but for the position of every word.

This, then, is the way in which the great experiment, if one may so describe it, worked out in a particular instance. Such instances might be multiplied, and the inference as to the nature of a liberal education, which means an education in good taste, could not be disregarded. But the experiment of a classical training still continues, nor can we disregard the results as they appear, or are wanting, in the successive generations of young men and women who throng to our higher institutions of learning in search of what is termed culture. What can we discover from a scrutiny of our students?

First, those relatively few young persons of our day who possess an adequate grounding in Greek and Latin have this in common with the English poets: they know something about grammar—not English grammar specifically, nor Greek, nor Latin, but grammar in general. They recognize subject, copula, and predicate whenever they meet them; they have an understanding for order and relation in the parts of a sentence. They are accustomed to see the elements of language as elements, and are not incapable of arranging them. They know the difference between a temporal and a causal connective; they can distinguish between *post hoc* and *propter hoc*—a highly important distinction in life. The reason they can do this is that, whereas it is possible to express oneself either loosely or distinctly in English, according to one's previous education, both Greek and Latin compel the schoolboy to make a sharp distinction between one thought and another. This is precisely what those who have missed a severe linguistic training are never prone to do. An observant teacher should know whereof he speaks. He should know why he is glad to welcome students of Latin and Greek to his classes in English. There may be exceptions; if so, they are negligible. In the long run, they who have done well with Greek and Latin in the preparatory school can write passable English as Freshmen, and they who have had neither are ungrammatical and otherwise slovenly in usage.

Next, the youth with a classical training has a superior knowledge, not only of connectives that are by themselves non-significant, but also of the significant elements of the English vocabulary. In particular, as compared with the youth who lacks that training, he recognizes and can use what we call 'learned words', that is, the words which an educated man employs, and an uneducated man does not employ. Year after year one may toil with uneducated Sophomores over the sixth stanza of Coleridge's *Dejection, an Ode*, that stanza in which the author has epitomized his tragic life. And why this recurrent toil? Because the poet has made use of terms like *resource*, *research*, and *abstruse*—

And haply by abstruse research to steal  
From my own nature all the natural man—  
This was my sole resource—



which fifteen out of twenty in a class will mispronounce, and which they do not comprehend, being unfamiliar with the Latin element in modern French and English. The ugly combination 'research work' (and who is responsible for this pronunciation?) does not, one may guess, occur in any English poet. Our fifteen Sophomores will dimly gather what the combination signifies, because in *work* they see their ancient foe; they will look wise or otherwise when told that *research* is a 'learned word'; they will smile when they hear that its fellow is one of those that competent students of Latin and English call 'popular'.

Again, the fit though few among those who engage in the study of English have more orderly minds for the larger details, as well as the smaller, in written composition. They excel their untutored comrades in joining sentence to sentence when they build up a paragraph, and in linking paragraph to paragraph to form an essay. And why is this? Because the fit though few have had their mental operations regulated by a progress through some portions of Greek and Latin literature; and because the Greek and Latin authors that have come down to us differ from the rank and file of modern authors in possessing a more excellent sequence of thought. We ought forthwith to guard against any misapprehension that the ancient Classics are to be deemed in all ways superior to modern literature. On the contrary, it is evident that in developing a boy of our generation into a clear-headed gentleman, if the ancients will help more in making him clear-headed (and yet to some extent gentle as well), the modern writers, or some of them, can perform the greater service in creating in him a clean and tender heart. The fact remains, however, that in Sophocles, the train of thought is more cogent than in Shakespeare, as the internal order of a speech in the *Odyssey* is more lucid than in *Paradise Lost*.

Fourthly, the boy with the classical training, since he is not so apt to be muddle-headed, is more likely to discriminate against false sentiment in what he reads, and still more likely to object to metrical bombast or nonsense when it is offered to him as poetry. Said Coleridge's redoubtable teacher at Christ's Hospital, the connections of a declamation are not the transitions of poetry. Bad, however, as they are, they are better than apostrophes and 'O thou's', for at best they are something like common sense.

Since the time of Coleridge the besetting sin of poets has been a lack of precision and good sense. In her fumbling description of *A Lost Chord*, Adelaide Procter writes:

It seemed the harmonious echo  
From our discordant life.

The echo of a discord is not harmonious. A boy who has studied the *Metamorphoses* of Ovid is aware that in literature as in his own experience an echo is true when it closely resembles the original sound. As an able critic notes,

Sentimentality has, in this disguise or that, existed and poisoned English poetry at all times since the six-

teenth century. But, for its fellow vice, vagueness, this is otherwise. For vagueness there has indeed been no time so fertile as the first forty years of the nineteenth century.

The beginning of the twentieth century is not free from it. Greek poetry in the fifth century before Christ is never vague or sentimental, nor is Homer or Vergil. When he is imbued with the spirit of Greek and Latin verse, our Freshman is in some measure armed against the insidious attacks of bad taste. And that is why the aged Wordsworth advised his nephew:

Remember, first read the ancient classical authors;  
then come to us; and you will be able to judge for  
yourself which of us is worth reading.

Fifthly, the boy who has been drilled in the Classics has an immense advantage because he knows something of ancient story—of ancient mythology in the wide sense—and is not unacquainted with those living images, divine yet human, in which the ancients embodied their highest conceptions of man, and their noblest religious convictions, the head and front of their culture. In dealing with English authors, he is not continually checked and baffled by allusions which were intended to be clear, and are so to an educated public. To the boy who is otherwise trained, that is, untrained for the study of English, they are not clear, and may envelop in an atmosphere of uncertainty passage after passage in any substantial author that he happens to take up. Can he appreciate George Eliot in *Romola* when she likens the shifty Tito Melema to Bacchus, if he is wholly innocent of ancient ideas concerning the slippery and unstable Dionysus? And how can he read Milton if he is unfamiliar not only with the Bible, but also with Homer and Vergil? For, be it noted that, whatever the reason, a decline of interest in the Scriptures has gone hand in hand with a growing indifference to the literature of Greece and Rome. Indeed, one is reminded that Charles the Great, at a critical juncture for modern civilization, enjoined the study of letters, that is, of Latin, upon his clergy, in order that the study of the Scriptures might not languish in his realm. Would that a modern statesman might arise with equal power to influence our general education, and that shortly no one having the name of a cultivated man might be unable to read at first hand the most sublime of all mysteries, in the Greek of the New Testament. The boy with the classical training has immediate access to the highest ideal of mankind.

In this gamut of advantages we have run from small details to large considerations. We began with the discipline a youth may receive through Greek and Latin in using the elements of expression; we have come to the benefit he may derive from these subjects in the interpretation of human discourse as a whole, and in the assimilation of humanizing ideas. It is common, of course, to separate the disciplinary function of the Classics from the cultural; it is better to assume that no such cleavage exists. One never can draw a sharp

line of demarcation between the form of expression and the idea that is expressed, or view the spirit apart from the letter through which it is revealed. And so long as this is so, literary discipline, involving a detailed examination of language, cannot be severed from literary culture.

In fact, these remarks will have been in vain if they have not led up to the notion that all culture is unified, and that its final aim is this: to eliminate the trivial and the false from our ideal of humanity; to abstract from the best sources, however minute or distant, whatever will define and ennoble that ideal; and to transmit an ever more vital image of humanity for daily contemplation by the next and succeeding generations. This is what teachers of the humanities are striving to do, whether they know it or not, and whether they deal with Greek and Latin, or French or German or English. As a teacher of English, inspired with a belief in the unity of culture, I have wished in this presence to support the contention that, as in the history of Europe, so in the development of the individual American, the basic elements of this ideal are most promptly secured through direct contact with Greek and Latin. When a foundation has been laid by competent instruction in the elements, we teachers of the modern Christian literatures can proceed with the superstructure.

This paper is primarily addressed to teachers of the Classics, secondarily to principals of schools and other men of influence in preparatory education.

To the teachers of the Classics one may say: There is at this time a great need of mutual recognition and support among all the friends of culture in America; but perhaps the need is greatest as between scholars in the ancient languages and students of the modern vernacular. They depend upon each other in performing their due service to the State; for the teaching of the ancient Classics without observing their relation to modern life is only less futile than the study of English when it is dissociated from the accumulated experience of the past. Yet we should not exclude from our ideal organization any person whatsoever who contributes to the enriching and intensifying of human life. And perhaps, all told, the friends of real as opposed to ostensible culture are not so few as we teachers sometimes imagine. Few or many, if they would but make their cause a common one, they would hold the fort against any assault. The foes of culture, the haters of ideas and ideals are many—how often are they haters of Greek! And the officious heralds of a shallow and meaningless culture, who abhor the industry without which no cultivation ever was obtained, may be fraudulent and dangerous. They are not and cannot be at one in their efforts, however, since they have nothing positive to unite them; but they do succeed in deterring young people who are ignorant of what is good and bad in education from taking up the proper studies at the proper time.

The foe is numerous but unorganized. On what ground can the friends of culture best unite? To what

practical effort can we teachers of the humanities most profitably devote our superabundant strength? To the maintenance and advancement of the study of Greek. Let us concentrate our defense where the attack is most frequent. If Greek were eventually to disappear from the curriculum of all the schools, Latin in no long time would follow, and sooner or later the serious study of modern languages and literatures would be discountenanced, too. Every blow that is dealt for Greek is favorable to humane learning in its entirety. If Greek is duly cared for, Latin will take care of itself, and so will English. If the teachers of all these subjects would combine for the rehabilitation of Greek, no enemy could withstand them. The program is simple: all we need do is to have the faith of the centurion, and advise a small number of promising young men and women every year to begin the study.

There are, indeed, signs of hope for the future. If I am not deceived, the cause of Greek is now growing stronger in the Eastern section of the country; the conservative South has never lost its hold upon the subject; and the great Middle West is imitative in matters of education, so that a renaissance of any sort in New England would ere long be duplicated in those Western sections which draw so many of their teachers from the older Universities. One thing, at least, is very significant. Within the last year or two, our teachers of the Classics, if I may be allowed to say so, have become noticeably less apologetic in their speech and attitude; they are growing more and more courageous. It would seem that they only need to act as if they were not losing but winning, and to recognize and abet their friends in other subjects. As for some teachers of Latin, they might well manifest at least a higher selfishness, and not be penny-wise. Too many have been merely bent on saving themselves for the moment, instead of rushing to defend the point where the enemy has been most successful. As for the teachers of the Modern Languages, they should act upon the knowledge they have; they are aware that the first-hand acquaintance with the Classics is the indispensable prerequisite for any real insight into Italian, Spanish, English, French, and German.

To the principals of secondary schools one might speak in a different way, and as follows. The arguments in support of Greek and Latin are many and varied; it is impossible to arrange and develop them here. All of them are doubtless contained in Professor Kelsey's collection of papers, by various hands, in the volume entitled *Latin and Greek in American Education* (published by the Macmillan Company<sup>2</sup>). It is hard to believe that any one could resist the evidence in that volume; but it will do no harm to refer to another book, by that eminent teacher in Russia, Professor Zielinski. His lectures on *Our Debt to Antiquity* enable one to see that the present chaos in American education has a parallel in another country.

<sup>2</sup>See THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY, 5:89-90, 97-98.

The special point for every sensible man who has a voice in guiding our secondary education is this: Either the arguments advanced by those who have studied the *Classcis* to some purpose are sound and convincing, or they are not. For nine out of ten bright boys and girls, Greek either does what it is said to do, or it does not. We may leave out of account the rare exception of a brilliant mind that is, so to speak, incapable of learning this language. We hear of such minds, and one is inclined to believe they exist; but I must add that I have never met one. The capable boys I have known, and some dull ones, too, have been able to master the subject when they have not suffered from bad teaching. And we may also disregard the incompetent teacher of Greek—the pedant who does not make his pupils read as soon as they can, and lets them form the bad habit of treating the language as if it were a Chinese puzzle; or the ignoramus who himself is unable to read continuously in either of the ancient tongues. These scattered individuals we may pass by. In general, it is safe to say, teachers of the Classics are trained to do their duty, and they perform their office better, on the whole, than any other set of instructors, especially in the High Schools. To return, then: Either Greek affects the subsequent career of the pupil as it is said to affect him, or it does not. If it does not, we are free to neglect it in our schools. But if it does, we are bound to promote this study unless we are willing to lose our own self-respect. If one never does read Greek, or, having read it long ago, has forgotten the experience, how can he decide the question of its value? No doubt the books of Kelsey and Zielinski would assist one in forming independent judgment; but it would be desirable also to consult a number of masterpieces themselves, at least in translation. One might read the Republic of Plato in the version of Jowett, and the Nicomachean Ethics as translated by Weldon, and then, let us say, the Politics. If, being previously unacquainted with those fountains of good sense and lofty inspiration, one were to find in them something of permanent value, it would be right to believe the persons who read the original as well as the pale translation, and who declare that the Greek is better than the English version. And, finally, let us consider what we owe to the boys and girls whose education has been entrusted to our hands by our Nation and our Maker.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY.

LANE COOPER.

### REVIEWS

A First Year Latin Course. By James B. Smiley and Helen L. Storke. New York: The American Book Company (1914). Pp. 411. \$1.00.

Among the many Latin books, good and bad, for beginners published during recent years has appeared now and then a volume of more than ordinary interest. Such a volume is the newly revised edition of Smiley and Storke's work. In the new book the authors have produced what appears to be a very serviceable treatise for the first year of Latin study.

Some of the noteworthy features in the seventy-seven lessons are a fairly early introduction of the passive voice (Lesson 12), of participles, including the ablative absolute construction (Lesson 32), and of the subjunctive mood (Lesson 36). The distinction between the use of the pronouns *suus* and *eius* is clearly and fully expressed (page 139). Another feature worthy of mention is the grouping of words having the same root, the latter being indicated at the head of the secondary list at the end of nearly every lesson. This is a valuable aid to the pupil. Some of the words in these lists are translated for the young learner, while others are left with a question mark that he may determine the meaning of these words for himself. He is thus led easily and naturally from the known to the unknown, a sound pedagogical method, whose psychology, though commonplace, is unfortunately not always observed by teachers of the Classics. Following these word-lists are given brief lists of common English derivatives. Lessons 45 and 46 offer some exceedingly useful hints on word-formation, a point too often neglected in beginners' books. The suggestive lists of English derivatives, so freely interspersed throughout the book, make the daily lessons at once 'practical' and interesting to the student. The important aoristic perfect is well explained on page 117.

Although the book contains less than eighty lessons, space has been found for a simple, yet fairly substantial treatment of conditional sentences (Lessons 68-70), and of the supines (Lesson 73). These lessons are so arranged that they may be omitted, by the teacher who so desires, without impairing the other parts of the book.

Along the lines of adverse criticism one may note an occasional tendency here, as in many first year books, to allow the expression of more or less unnatural ideas to appear, e. g. § 40, II, Sentences 2, 5, and 6; § 45, II, 5-6; § 82, II, 4; § 90, II, 4; § 99, II, 6; § 132, II, 7; § 286, II, 3; etc. Stilted expressions of all kinds should be studiously avoided in teaching the young. In the matter of normal Latin word-order the reviewer does not wholly agree with the authors' views as expressed in the second and third clauses of the first sentence of § 88, although he is aware that many writers uphold this view, including both Hale and D'Ooge. The views of Greenough, Preble and others have always seemed preferable. But this is mainly a matter of opinion. It would be well for the teacher to present to the student both views in regard to the normal emphasis of the last word (or words) in a Latin sentence, allowing the novitiate to adopt whichever plan enables him to read the language more easily and rapidly. In some of the exercises the second person of the verb is used rather more frequently, perhaps, than the usual reading in High School Latin would justify; e. g. § 523, II, 2, 3, 5, and 6. There are but six sentences altogether in this exercise. The passive imperative is, perhaps, unduly emphasized in Lesson 71: §§ 526, c., and 530.

The arrangement of paradigms, as well as of the principles of syntax, is logical and adequate; in some



instances, admirable. Judiciously interwoven are nearly one hundred illustrations covering a wide variety of subjects, such as a Roman school, coins of Caesar showing Gallic trophies, a Roman villa, the Porta Negra at Trier, the tomb of Caecilia Metella, several views in Algeria, including the Arch of Trajan, a Roman bath, a scene at Vergil's tomb, the Roman theater at Tingad, a Roman bakery, a Roman granary at Ostia, mural paintings from Pompeii, the Rhine, coins of Dumnorix and of Vercingetorix, a Roman peasant, a view of modern Pompeii from an aeroplane, the Forum, looking west, two views of Delos, etc.

As long as a preparation for the reading of Caesar's Gallic War continues to be the *summum bonum* of first-year Latin study, this work of Smiley and Storke deserves wide use.

BROADWAY HIGH SCHOOL,  
Seattle, Washington.

ANDREW OLIVER.

P. Terenti Afri Andria. Edited by E. H. Sturtevant. New York: The American Book Company (1914). Pp. 188. 72 cents.

This edition of the Andria contains several novel and attractive features. The development of comedy is traced, not by a historical sketch, but by means of fairly long passages, in English, from The Birds, Iphigenia in the Land of the Taurians, Menander's Periceomene, and the Aulularia. Suetonius's life of Terence, with rather full notes, takes the place of the customary biography in English; in § 5 the editor adopts the reading *quintum atque tricesimum egressus annum*. He omits the usual outline of the plot, "so as not to lessen the students' interest in the play itself" (so the Preface, p. 5); it may be doubted, however, whether this is really a wise omission, for the plot is fairly complicated, and the language difficult "for students who are making their first acquaintance with ancient drama" (Preface, p. 5). The few pages (51-58) devoted to meter and prosody are fairly satisfactory for a brief treatment; but *mē aūt* (208, note) seems very questionable—better were the elision of the long vowel. In the text itself all metrical accents are printed, save those at the ends of verses.

The editor commendably refuses to print *ch*, *ph*, *th*, *y* (apparently *z* does not occur in the play), as they were not in use until after Terence's day. Accordingly he gives us such spellings as *Crusidem* (85), *Pampilus* (88), *Perintiam* (9), *Glucium* (134); *Athenas* (907, text and note) must be an oversight. Curiously enough, however, he prints *u* and *v* (e. g. *utramvis*, 10, *vituperant* 15) and pleads for this in his Preface as usual in editions of later writers. It is a pity that, having had the courage to print such words as *sucopantam* (815), he should not have been consistent.

The notes contain a surprisingly large number of repetitions or needless cross-references. So, e. g., the notes on 98 and 100 both contain references to the comment on *gnati* in 49; those on 148, 150, 302 all refer back to the comment on *qui* in 53; that on 377 refers to a statement on *ipsus* given so recently as on

360. The spelling *Cremes* is annotated in 247, 361, 368, 472, 538, 550. The note on *periculum* (565) is repetition from that on 131.

The notes on archaic forms and spellings are well handled in the main, but with widely varying degrees of fulness of detail. The genitives *eius* and *quouis* are commented on at some length (93, 763); *duint* (666) is dismissed briefly as a "subjunctive of *duo*", though *faxim* and *sim* are called optatives (753); *atligas* (789) "is an early Latin variant of *attingas*", whose nature is not explained. It is truly a nice question how far it is wise to go into detail in such annotations for beginners; and it is for beginners that Professor Sturtevant is professedly writing.

*Quid istic* (572) could have been best illustrated by quoting Plautus Epidicus 141 *quid istic verba facimus?* The mooted *tu si hic sis, aliter sentias* (310) is called a contrary to fact condition; many will still prefer to call it a less vivid future. The word "marvelous" (p. 49) seems a rather strong term to apply to certain qualities in the new fragments of Menander. It seems questionable whether *contaminatio* (p. 50) was really a technical word at all. Correct the note on *fieri* (972) with the aid of Plautus Am. 567, Most. 722, Poen. 1056. Wise and helpful remarks are those on sentence accent (p. 52); the genitives in 261, 262; *-io* verbs of the third conjugation (322); *ecum* and *ante hac* (532); the afterthought (609); purchasing power of money (951)—points usually passed over in silence in annotated texts. The *alter exitus* of the play is not mentioned. I have noticed only two misprints: "excellencies" (p. 37), and *Athenas*, in 907, both text and notes.

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY. ARTHUR WINFRED HODGMAN.

#### CLASSICAL CONFERENCE AT CLINTON NEW YORK

On Saturday, February 20, a Conference in The Interest of Classical Teaching was held at Clinton, New York. 39 persons, 13 from Clinton, 26 from adjoining towns, were present.

Professor W. G. Spenser, of Colgate University, using a class of fifteen pupils from the Clinton High School, gave a Demonstration in Sight Reading with a Third Year Latin Class. He based the lesson on "The Threefold Pronoun", placing in the hands of the pupils slips based on Hints and Helps for the Student of Latin, a pamphlet published by Professor John Greene of Colgate University (at Hamilton, 1914). He took this topic, dealing with the relative, the indefinite and the interrogative pronouns, because Cicero is so full of *qu*-words.

Miss Grace I. Spencer of the Utica Free Academy discussed the difficulties of sight reading (1) for the teacher, (2) for the pupil. She referred to H. W. Johnston's The Teaching of Second Year Latin (Scott, Foresman and Company). Teachers should require good English translations by pupils; under syntax they should ask questions only on the notes on the passage under study; they should review declensions and conju-

gations. Passages for sight reading should always be selected from the next lesson. Difficulties of pupils, as listed by Utica Free Academy teachers, included (1) ignorance of words, even familiar words: such ignorance causes inability to follow the thought; (2) inability to group words properly; tendency to read without dividing the sentence; (3) difficulties with the threefold pronoun; (4) ignorance of prefix and suffix forms; (5) superficial observation of words; (6) too much haste to translate. Classes should be trained in patience. Success in sight work, finally, depends on the use of an appropriate passage.

Principal Meritt of Gloversville emphasized the study of Greek. He deplored short-cut methods. The Classics are a foundation for developing the spiritual side of life.

Dr. Fitch, of Hamilton College, gave an illustrated lecture on The Religion of Apollo and the Oracle at Delphi, dealing specially with the revelations made by the French in the last twenty-five years, through their excavations.

At the close of the lecture the Conference organized as a subsidiary of The New York State Classical Association, comprising the Counties of Oneida, Madison, and Herkimer, with Principal Henry D. Hopkins, of New Hartford, as President, and Mr. B. H. Woodward, of the Utica Academy, as Secretary-Treasurer.

P. L. WIGHT.

### MEETINGS

The teachers of Westchester County organized Saturday, March 13, in Tarrytown as a section of The Classical Association of New York State. Dr. W. T. Vlymen, Principal of the Eastern District High School of Brooklyn, gave the principal address. The officers elected were: President, P. A. Cook, Yonkers; Vice-President, Mary L. Overocker, Ossining; Secretary, W. S. Mulford, Yonkers; Treasurer, Marguerite Richardson, Hastings-on-Hudson.

The St. Lawrence County Section of The Classical Association of New York State was organized on February 12 at the Potsdam Normal School. Mr. S. Dwight Arms conducted a round table on the general problems confronting the Latin teacher, followed by a detailed discussion of first year Latin, with particular regard to the ways and means of arousing interest.

### THE NEW YORK LATIN CLUB

A special meeting of The New York Latin Club was held on March 6, at Washington Irving High School, to discuss The Subject-Matter of First Year Latin.

Professor Knapp, who led the discussion, presented the suggestions of a group of five teachers of Latin. The main ideas were (1) that the total amount to be accomplished in the Four Year High School course should not be less than at present, but that there should be a different distribution of work throughout the first two years. (2) In particular, it was suggested that the period of infancy should be prolonged by an entire half year, i. e., that the beginners' stage should take up three

half years instead of two. Then, by slower and surer, because more thorough, progress at the start, by securing more time in the first year for the requisite drill, especially through the postponement of forms, and, in larger measure, of syntactical points to the third half year, by making a better transition from the second to the third half year, filling up the gap now felt so keenly between these two half years, by proper grading of the reading matter so that the pupil may be introduced early and naturally to complex sentences, to the periodic structure etc., much more reading of Latin (some, perhaps much of it, 'made' Latin) as a whole could be done in the first year and far better and surer and pleasanter progress be made in the third and fourth half years. With the fourth half year the reading of Caesar or Nepos or the like might well begin.

Concrete suggestions illustrating these general ideas were then presented.

A spirited and interesting discussion followed, in which many took part.

JANE G. CARTER, *Censor*.

### THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF PITTSBURGH AND VICINITY

The third meeting of the year was held at Pennsylvania College for Women, on February 13. Professor R. B. English, of Washington and Jefferson College, gave a splendid illustrated lecture on Europe Ancient and Modern in the Throes of War. Mr. F. L. Matteson read a paper on Non-Essentials in the Teaching of First Year Latin, which was thought so important by those present that it was decided to have it repeated at the next meeting, in conjunction with The Association of Secondary Schools of the Upper Ohio Valley.

The fourth meeting was held at the University of Pittsburgh, on March 6. Great interest was shown in Miss Paxson's play, A Roman School, presented by boys of the Homestead High School, under the direction of Miss Sara E. Covert. President R. M. Russell, of Westminster College, speaking of the Practical Value of the Classics, said that the Classics give an insight into language, a broader vocabulary, keen discrimination of synonyms, first-hand knowledge of ancient thought and a broader culture. Miss Alta Fretts read a suggestive paper on What Latin Words Are Most Useful for Increasing an English Vocabulary, and Mr. Matteson repeated his paper, which it is hoped will be published.

B. L. ULLMAN.

### SOCIETAS GENTIUM LATINA

For a year or more some professional and business men, some of them out of College for more than thirty years, have been meeting informally, every fortnight, to talk Latin. On February 1, 1915, these men incorporated, in the State of New York, the Societas Gentium Latina. The objects of the Association are "to ascertain and introduce methods for increasing interest in Latin and its use as a living language, especially through the experience of its members in employing the language as a means of social and intellectual intercourse."

The annual dues of the Society are \$5.00, except for men engaged professionally in teaching Latin or Greek; for the latter the dues are \$3.00 per year. The meetings are held twice a month, in the evening, in the office of Dr. H. C. deV. Cornwell, President, 40 East 41st Street, New York City. All men are cordially invited to be present, and, further, to become members. Additional information may be had from Mr. Chandler Davis, English Secretary of the Societas, 1 Broadway, New York City.

C. K.